



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*Clm*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,921	03/30/2004	Hiromitsu Yamakawa	25-274	3168
40615	7590	05/08/2007	EXAMINER	
ARNOLD INTERNATIONAL			PHAM, HAI CHI	
P. O. BOX 129			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GREAT FALLS, VA 22066-0129			2861	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/08/2007		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/811,921	YAMAKAWA, HIROMITSU
	Examiner Hai C. Pham	Art Unit 2861

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 April 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 3-5,7,8,11-13,15,16,18 and 20-23.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*Hai C. Pham*

HAI PHAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

5/2/07

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument is not persuasive.

A. The Applicant is referred to MPEP 2144.05, paragraph IIA and III, where in order to successfully rebut a prima facie case of obviousness based on the desired range, "the applicant must show that the particular range is critical". Such criticality of the claimed range has not been demonstrated in the current disclosure. The current disclosure indicates that the claimed imaging lens preferably satisfies the currently claimed condition with a tighter range, i.e., condition (4) shown at page 13, line 11, as well as a broader range defined by the condition (3) as shown at page 11, line 19, the latter condition is met by the applied prior art in Imakawa et al. The Specification further goes on to provide eight specific Embodiments where the imaging lens is only required to meet the broader range of condition (3). In other words, there is no evidence of the criticality of the claimed range for the imaging lens, where one would expect a new and unpredicted result from the claimed invention relative to the applied art.

B. Applicant further argues that "[T]he rejection [of claim 5, as well as claims 13 and 21] fails to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness" based on the claimed limitation set forth at the last 3 lines of claim 5. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Harris discloses an imaging lens system including a diffractive lens whose surface has a multi-level structure, which possesses a diffractive phase function superimposed thereon for the purpose of flattening the field curvature of the imaging lens system. As such, the combination of the references in the rejection of claims 5, 13 and 21 meets the three basic criteria required for establishing a prima facie case of obviousness, namely (1) the motivation for combining is plainly suggested by Harris, (2) there is a reasonable expectation of success since the applied art references are from the same endeavor and (3) the combined prior art references teach all the claimed limitations.

HCP  
May 2, 2007